

CONFIDENTIAL

12/14/70

Dear Jim,

First let us dispense with the formalities.

I take it your conversation with Moore was by phone. The corroborating statements are not essential and, unless the two friends were on extensions, of no real value. If this was a personal conversation, however, or if they were hearing both ends, as a matter of record it would be good to have them.

There remains a question in my mind did he know you or was he trying to know himself?

As of now, the important things, as I see it, is that this eliminates the need for conjecturing what we should have taken for granted did happen and I had always assumed had, that the pictures and X-rays were studied. I had known that the Commission staff saw the X-rays, and I know when, and who showed them. I had known who showed one staff member one picture, and which one, when and where this happened. What I wish could be expanded is "Lots of people saw 'em." Who is what I wish there were some way of knowing, plus when and where, with or without experts present to interpret them.

He is correct in saying "they couldn't give you angles, or anything like that". But they bear on many things besides that, including the imputed parlay and the possible directions as well as whether or not of entry, the kind of projectile, many, many things the average investigator would have no way of knowing.

In Dallas Zapruder, personally, showed the film many times. If he didn't see it often in Washington, which I presume he did, it is likely Moore did see it often in Dallas, especially if he took others to Zapruder to see it. Zapruder is my source on his having it and showing it repeatedly. However, just looking at the brief movie is not photo intelligence. It is only recently that I have been able to arrange for getting some of the more obvious and more basic work done with it. This work was not done by the feds or they have been extremely careful to hide it.

Bolden is out of jail. Who he has talked to and how he did since then makes me wonder about the state of his mental health. As of now, I think that in the absence of what we do not have and seemingly have no prospect of getting, the best thing we can do with and about him is forget. Some of the things he has said make we wonder about his dependability, too.

Your landlord just may know something, for important investigations were done in your area, especially about film. I am careful not to give you what he can feed back. Perhaps he has heard of this? I think it is proper to hide his identity. He could be hurt otherwise. I often hide my sources. In the book to come out next year on the King case, I have to even eliminate what some people said, for unless I did they might be killed. Nobody working with me knows their names. I have the tapes of these interviews in a safe-deposit box. Such things are normal and right. Do not apologize for it. People must be dealt with honorably and we must respect their wishes - indeed, consider their possible problems if they do not.

Hasty thanks. I look forward to what you will next write.

Sincerely,